

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were pending in the application at the time the Final Office Action was mailed. The applicants responded on June 22, 2004 to the Final Office Action of April 22, 2004, and the Examiner issued an Advisory Action on July 27, 2004. The Advisory Action did not indicate whether the amendments of June 22, 2004 were entered. Accordingly, the applicants make the same amendments in this response, and incorporate their prior arguments here by reference. Moreover, the applicants amend claims 1-2, 4, 6, 7-8, 13-16, 21, and 42 in this response to further clarify aspects of the applicants' technology and correct typographical errors. Accordingly, claims 1-54 are pending.

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-54 as follows:

A) Claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 18-19, 21-22, 24-32, 36-39, 42-46, and 48-53 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,237,025 ("Ludwig"). Thus, all independent claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Ludwig.

B) Claims 9, 11, 23 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ludwig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,600,725.

C) Claims 16-17 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ludwig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313.

D) Claims 20, 40-41, 47, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ludwig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,112.

The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The applicants' technology provides an application program interface ("API") of a multipoint processing module, as discussed thoroughly throughout the applicants' specification. An API may be used by other software components such as applications

and software modules to receive functionality and control the multipoint processing module. As an example, an application may use aspects of the API to receive videoconferencing functionality using computing devices and associated peripherals, and another application may use aspects of the API to receive teleconferencing functionality. By using the API, an application developer can provide the functionality received from the multipoint processing module without providing extensive program logic that would otherwise be required to provide the functionality. These applications may be provided by different software vendors who choose to use the API provided by the multipoint processing module.

Ludwig is directed to a "multimedia collaboration system that integrates separate real-time and asynchronous networks." (Ludwig, Abstract.) "These capabilities are achieved by exploiting a variety of hardware, software and networking technologies in a manner that preserves the quality and integrity of audio/video/data and other multimedia information." (Id.) Ludwig provides an integrated solution, including hardware, software, and an application with a user interface.

At least two important differences exist between Ludwig's technique and the applicants' technology. First, Ludwig neither teaches nor suggests an API as recited by independent claims 1, 13, and 21. Second, Ludwig neither teaches nor suggests a multicast bridging terminal as recited by independent claim 42.

The applicants can find no mention of an extensibility mechanism in Ludwig that provides an API. An API, as suggested above, enables multiple software components, such as applications, to utilize functionality exposed by the API. As an example, the MICROSOFT WINDOWS operating system API enables multiple applications to use functionality provided by the operating system to create or modify files. Similarly, the applicants' technology provides an API for collaboration software applications to be designed that can use the API to send or receive collaboration-related information. Independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are amended by this response to more particularly recite

this feature. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite "exposing at least one application program interface by the multipoint processing module." Ludwig, in contrast, describes an integrated solution that does not allow other applications to control or use its functionality. Therefore, Ludwig has no reason to describe an API as claimed by the applicants.

Independent claim 42 recites creating a multicast bridging terminal. A multicast bridging terminal bridges clients using different types of control signaling. As an example, one client may use H.323 signaling, and another client may use a different variety of signaling. The Examiner refers to Ludwig at 37:1-65 as teaching a multicast bridging terminal. (Final Office Action, page 14.) This section of Ludwig discusses multi-party videoconferencing. Multi-party videoconferencing does not always necessitate a multicast bridging terminal, and Ludwig makes no mention of bridging two different types of control signaling in the cited section. The applicants can find no mention of a multicast bridging terminal using two different types of control signaling elsewhere in Ludwig. Accordingly, at least claim 42 cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ludwig.

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentable define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or would believe that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6478.

Dated: 9/21/09

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio

Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273

PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant